REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7-15, 17, and 19-31 are now pending in the application. Claims 24-31 are new. Support for the foregoing amendments can be found throughout the specification, drawings, and claims as originally filed. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-2, 5, 7-12, 17, and 19-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karp (U.S. Pat. No. 5,469,154) in view of Foster et al (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0181395 A1). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A CLOS network is just one type of non-blocking network. Applicant's Substitute Specification of December 28, 2007, para. [0028]. A strictly non-interfering network (SNIN) is a network for which the only queuing delays experienced by an admissible traffic pattern are attributable to the multiplexing of packets from slow links onto a faster link whose aggregate bandwidth at least equals the sum of the bandwidths of the smaller links. In a SNIN, competing traffic sources do not attempt to use the same network resources at the same time. The implementation of a SNIN requires that resources be dedicated through the network in support of an active communication session. In order to accomplish this, non-blocking networks can be used. See Applicant's Substitute Specification of December 28, 2007, para. [0025]. In other words, a non-blocking network, such as a CLOS network, does not by itself operate as a strictly non-interfering network.

Claim 1 recites that "the forwarding instructions create a path between each of the plurality of sources and each of the plurality of destinations <u>to make the CLOS network operate as a strictly non-interfering network</u>". Applicant submits that Karp fails to teach or suggest the above limitation.

The Examiner asserts that Karp teaches operating a CLOS network as a <u>strictly non-interfering network</u>, specifically referring to the abstract of Karp. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's assertion. Applicant has studied Karp carefully and submits that Karp at best appears disclose a <u>non-blocking</u> network. Karp appears silent about operating a CLOS network as a <u>strictly non-interfering network</u>, let alone <u>using the forwarding instructions</u> as recited in claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to further articulate the basis the rejection.

Applicant further submits that Foster fails to cure the deficiencies of Karp. Foster appear silent about the above limitations also.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claims 1, 10 and 17 define over the art cited by the Examiner. Likewise, claims 2-5, 7-9, and 21; claims 11-15 and 22; and claims 19-20 and 23, which depend from respective dependent claims 1, 10, and 17 also define over the art cited by the Examiner for one or more of the reasons set forth above regarding claim 1.

NEW CLAIMS

Applicant has added claims 24-31. Claim 24 is directed to, among other things, a method 1) that provides a plurality of nodes coupled to the first stage switches and each operable to act as a source and a destination and 2) that creates forwarding instructions

that create a path between each of the plurality of sources and each of the plurality of destinations, _dynamically allocated_, to make the CLOS network operate as a strictly non-interfering network. Applicant submits that Karp and Foster, individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the above limitations.

Karp at best appears to disclose that N1 input nodes coupled to a first stage switches and N2 output nodes coupled to a second stage switches, rather than that both input nodes and output nodes are coupled to a single stage switches.

Further, Karp at best appears to disclose creating paths between fixed N1 input nodes and N2 output nodes. In contrast, the claimed invention is directed to dynamic sets of sources and destinations allocated from the same plurality of nodes. The nodes contained in each set may change in different time windows. The claimed method creates forwarding instructions that create paths between the dynamic sets of sources and destinations to make the CLOS network operate as a strictly non-interfering network.

Applicant submits that Foster fails to cure the deficiencies of Karp. Foster appears to be silent about the above limitations.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claim 24 define over the art cited by the Examiner.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is

believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 18, 2008

By: /Joseph M. Lafata/
Joseph M. Lafata, Reg. No. 37,166

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

JML/PFD/evm